

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 to 6, and 11 to 13 remain pending. Claims 7 to 9 have been canceled.

The Office Action stated that claims 1 to 6 are allowable. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowability of claims 1 and 3 to 6. Claim 2 was canceled in a previous amendment. Clarification is requested.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. The rejection of claim 7 is moot since that claim has been canceled.

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being fully enabled. The rejection of claims 8 and 9 is moot since those claims have been canceled.

Claims 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled. The Office Action stated that the rejection could be overcome if step 5 of claim 12 was limited to a female bovine recipient.

The rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is overcome. Claim 12 as amended has a step 6 directed to a female bovine recipient.

Claims 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action stated that the term “occurring” was inconsistent as a verb and the term “selection” was confusing with respect to other claim language.

The rejection of claims 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is overcome. Claims 10 and 12 as amended delete “occurring”, insert “permitting to occur”, and delete “by homologous recombination” as suggested in the Office Action.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for omission of an essential step. The rejection of claim 12 is overcome in view of the amendment thereto requiring activating the embryo.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for omission of an essential step. The rejection of claim 13 is overcome in view of the amendment thereto requiring generating transgenic cattle and purifying the desired protein from milk of the cattle.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Sheng et al. journal article. The rejection of claim 8 is moot since that claim has been canceled.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Sheng et al. journal article and U.S. 2005/0177878 to Melo et al. The rejection of claim 9 is moot since that claim has been canceled.

Reconsideration of claims 11 to 13 is deemed warranted in view of the foregoing, and allowance of said claims is earnestly solicited. Maintenance of the allowability of claims 1, 3 to 6 is also earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles N. J. Ruggiero
Reg. No. 28,468
Attorney for Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero
& Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500

Dated: February 3, 2011